



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING BOARD

ROOM 304, WATERTOWN CITY HALL
245 WASHINGTON STREET
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380
(315) 785-7740

MEETING: December 1, 2015

PRESENT:

Sara Freda, Chairperson
Michelle Capone
Larry Coburn
Linda Fields
Anthony Neddo
Steve Rowell
Neil Katzman

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planner
Jeffrey Polkowski, Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Brian Drake, Civil Engineer II
Dale Herman, Fire Chief

ABSENT:

None

The December 1, 2015 Planning Board Meeting was called to order at 3:01 PM by Planning Board Chair Sara Freda. Ms. Freda called for a reading of the Minutes from the November 3, 2015 Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Fields made a motion to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Coburn and all voted in favor, except for Mr. Katzman, who had not arrived at the meeting yet.

WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL 241 COFFEEN STREET – PARCEL # 7-04-124.000

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Jason Gilmore of Gilmore's Lawncare and Snowplowing Service, LLC for the construction of a 1,200 square-foot, pre-fabricated cold storage building at 241 Coffeen Street, Parcel Number 7-04-124.000. Ms. Freda asked if Mr. Gilmore was in attendance to represent his request before the Planning Board. Mr. Gilmore stepped forward and identified himself.

Ms. Freda began by asking Mr. Gilmore to describe his request. Mr. Gilmore replied that he was asking for permission to build a cold storage building that would be about 30' x 40' in dimension.

Ms. Freda asked if the entire facility was a freezer. Mr. Gilmore replied that there were no freezers involved at all, and that it would just be for towed cars, boats and other garage-like storage.

Ms. Freda then asked if Mr. Gilmore had looked at the Memorandum that Staff had prepared. Mr. Gilmore replied that he had looked at it, and noted that there were remarks

about sidewalks. Ms. Freda said that in the Summary section of the Memorandum, there were usually conditions of approval. She then asked Mr. Gilmore if he would like to go through them at this time with the Planning Board. Mr. Gilmore said yes.

Ms. Freda then read the first summary item, "The applicant shall submit a revised plan that is adequately dimensioned, including proposed driveway radii." Ms. Fields then helped Mr. Gilmore find the list of summary items in his copy of Staff's Memorandum, so that he could read them along with the Planning Board.

Once Mr. Gilmore had found the list, Ms. Freda asked him if he would revise the submitted plans to meet the City Engineering Department's needs. Mr. Gilmore replied that his property was all driveway in the front and he was unsure what the City's requirement was. Ms. Fields told him that Staff was asking for more defined plans than what he had submitted. Mr. Gilmore asked what more he could plan. Mr. Neddo answered that adding metes and bounds was an example of the type of detail that Staff was looking for.

Mr. Drake then said that Staff specifically wanted there to be a single access point to the lot, as there is no existing elevated curb anywhere on the front of the parcel or on the neighboring parcel to the west. Mr. Gilmore replied that both lots were his, and that dividing the vehicular access would make the site more complicated. Mr. Drake said that the site, as it exists, looks pretty torn up.

Mr. Gilmore then said that installing a curb would be problematic because City snowplows turn around in his driveway. Mr. Drake said that a defined entrance would help the site. Mr. Polkowski noted that the site had no single designated entrance as it currently existed.

Mr. Coburn then told Mr. Gilmore that he needed to read the Memorandum, and that he was behind in the review process. Ms. Freda added that Mr. Gilmore should look at this review process as an opportunity to clean up his site, and decide what should be grass and what should be gravel. She then asked if that was what Staff wanted to see happen during this process. Mr. Drake said that was correct.

Mr. Gilmore then asked if he had to create grass on the site. Ms. Fields replied that he had to create a driveway so that it looked like it had an "in" and an "out." Mr. Drake then told Mr. Gilmore that he would have to tear out some of the pavement and replace it with grass for snow storage. Mr. Gilmore reiterated that snowplows turn around there and there was no way to plant grass. Mr. Drake asked if it was City snowplows that turned around there. Mr. Gilmore replied in the affirmative. Mr. Drake then said that a single driveway would prevent that.

Mr. Gilmore said that he couldn't convert his lot to have a single driveway because it defeated the purpose of having a garage. Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Gilmore exactly what his business on this site did. Mr. Gilmore replied that it was a tow and repair shop. Ms. Freda asked Mr. Gilmore to confirm that he was storing vehicles on the site. Mr. Gilmore said yes, and that he didn't want the vehicles to be sitting outside.

Mr. Drake then said that everyone would like a 75-foot driveway, but that the City prefers a single access point for safety reasons and an area for snow storage. Mr. Gilmore replied that he has never had an issue moving snow to the rear of his property and said actually it would be more of a hassle to do all this work. Mr. Drake replied that if the City ever reconstructed Coffeen Street, the City would not allow a 75-foot wide driveway, and added that Mr. Gilmore should take this opportunity to tell the City where he would like his driveway to be.

Mr. Neddo said that it appeared that there was an existing curb. Mr. Drake replied that in reality that area actually acts as a parking space in the median.

Ms. Freda then said that in addition to delineating a driveway, Staff also recommended replacing six or seven sidewalk blocks along Coffeen Street, which are currently in disrepair, so that they meet City specifications. Mr. Drake added that the existing sidewalks do not meet City specifications right now, and that any other site plan would require bringing them up to standard. Mr. Gilmore then asked where exactly Staff wanted to see the sidewalks replaced. Mr. Drake replied that it was near the western side of Mr. Gilmore's property.

Ms. Freda then said that the second and third summary items were related and asked if any of the Planning Board members had any other questions or comments about these summary items. Mr. Neddo then asked if there were any rules about the maximum width of driveway entrance construction. Mr. Drake answered that for Commercial Districts, it was up to approximately 30 feet or so.

Ms. Freda then told Mr. Gilmore that what was in his best interest was to meet with the City Engineering Department and come to an agreement on what is acceptable to them and then come back before the Planning Board after those discussions. Mr. Gilmore then said that when you want to put a building up, it should be easy. Mr. Coburn replied that it is not hard, but it has rules.

Ms. Freda then told Mr. Gilmore that the City Engineering Department could articulate to him the things that they expect out of every development. She then noted that the fourth summary item was about drainage and grading and the fifth was regarding the sidewalk. Mr. Gilmore then said that Staff and the Planning Board were asking for more than what he was asking to do. Ms. Fields replied that the Planning Board members had rules that they had to follow too.

Mr. Katzman arrived at the meeting at this time.

Ms. Freda then told Mr. Gilmore that the Planning Board could either table this application or act on it, perhaps not favorably to the applicant. She then asked Mr. Gilmore if he wanted the Planning Board to table his application or act on it. Mr. Gilmore replied that he didn't even know what that meant. Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Gilmore if he would like the opportunity to talk to the City Engineering Department about what Staff expected of his application. Mr. Gilmore said yes.

Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Gilmore again if he would like the Planning Board to move to table his application. Mr. Gilmore asked if he would need to attend another Planning Board meeting. Ms. Freda replied that he would.

Ms. Fields then moved to table the request submitted by Jason Gilmore of Gilmore's Lawncare and Snowplowing Service, LLC for the construction of a 1,200 square foot, pre-fabricated cold storage building at 241 Coffeen Street, Parcel Number 7-04-124.000. Mr. Katzman seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL 1 THOMPSON PARK – PARCEL # 12-30-101.000

The Planning Board then considered a request for a waiver of site plan approval submitted by Edward G. Olley Jr. of GYMO, D.P.C., on behalf of the New York State Zoo for the construction of a 579 square-foot building addition to the Otter Exhibit at the New York State Zoo, located at 1 Thompson Park, Parcel Number 12-30-101.000. Mr. Olley was in attendance to represent the project before the Planning Board.

Mr. Olley began by asking the Planning Board if everyone had looked at the site plan. The Planning Board members answered in the affirmative. Mr. Olley continued by saying that the plan consisted of removing the existing cages and replacing them with an enclosed structure for the otters. He said that when the otters weren't running around, they go indoors and that they needed a new enclosed space. He then added that another component of the project was to repair the water filtration equipment, which was not functioning, and to install electric service, which was a part of a separate City project.

Mr. Olley then addressed Staff's concern, described in the Memorandum, that the applicant proposed to dispose of wastewater through a storm system and onsite drywell, which Staff had deemed unacceptable. Mr. Olley said that the water in question was really stormwater, not wastewater, and the changes were proposed as a solution to handle drainage from the swimming pond by putting it somewhere other than in the yard. He then said that since this proposed solution was not desirable for the City Engineering Department or the City Code Enforcement Bureau, that there will now be no change in the way the exhibit functions.

Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Olley if he was eliminating something from his proposed site plan. Mr. Olley replied that he was eliminating any proposed drainage changes on the drawing. Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Olley for a construction timeframe. Mr. Olley replied that the zoo's otters would be returning in May and that the exhibit must be finished by then, and that work must begin in April. He added that it was crucial to begin removing the roofing over the existing cages right away.

Ms. Freda then asked if any members of the Planning Board had questions about the application. Ms. Fields said that Staff's Memorandum contradicted Mr. Olley's claim that drainage from the exhibit was stormwater rather than wastewater. Mr. Olley replied that he had a pool and he treated his pool water as if it were stormwater. Mr. Polkowski noted that humans using a pool have a sense of sanitary responsibility and were unlikely to defecate in the water as animals do.

Mr. Olley then said that week-old, dirty water in the exhibit has to be disposed of and replaced with clean water, regardless of what the otters do in it. Mr. Katzman then asked if the water is purified or filtered. Mr. Olley replied that it was purified. Ms. Capone then noted the problem was that the zoo was failing to provide an approved sewage disposal method that would be acceptable to the City.

Mr. Olley said once again that when the zoo disposes of the water in the otter exhibit, that it is really stormwater disposal, not sanitary wastewater disposal. He said that there are no sanitary facilities in the vicinity of the exhibit. Mr. Olley then said that extending the City sewer is a part of every master plan ever done for the zoo. He added that at some point in time, the sewers at the zoo and at Thompson Park in general must be upgraded; however the zoo would need to continue to take water from the exhibit and dump it in the woods until that day comes.

Mr. Katzman then asked exactly how much water the zoo was discharging. Mr. Olley replied that the ponds for the otters have 4,000 gallons of water. Mr. Katzman then said that it was his understanding that the zoo was not discharging all of that water, however, and asked Mr. Olley to verify this. Mr. Olley confirmed that not all the water was discharged. Mr. Katzman then said that tabling this application for one month would not hurt anything.

Ms. Capone then asked if removing all the sewer-related language from the proposed plans would affect anything. Mr. Polkowski replied that it would still result in wastewater entering storm drains. Mr. Olley again said that the water in question was stormwater, not wastewater. Mr. Polkowski reiterated that the water still contained fecal matter.

Ms. Capone then said that it was evident that there needed to be further discussion between Staff and the applicant regarding an approved method of sewage disposal. Mr. Olley said that the water discussion was a separate issue from the site plan, and that the Planning Board should approve the waiver. Ms. Capone replied that she felt that there was no reason that the Planning Board needed to push this proposal through too quickly.

Mr. Olley then said that the City of Watertown is funding part of this work. Mr. Polkowski then asked Mr. Olley if the zoo had a filter to remove fecal coliform. Mr. Olley replied in the affirmative. Mr. Drake then said that according the City Code, the water in the otter exhibit was wastewater, not stormwater.

Mr. Olley then said that you could look at every exhibit in the zoo that way if that were the case. He said that if wolves stand in their drinking water and defecate in it; you still dump that water on the ground. Ms. Freda asked Mr. Olley to keep the discussion to the exhibit that was under discussion. Mr. Olley replied that the proposed project under discussion was a stand-alone project by itself and that the Planning Board should let the City Engineering Department and the zoo worry about sanitary sewers as they move into the future.

Mr. Rowell asked if there were any City Zoning ordinances that related to water. Mr. Polkowski noted that the City had been designated as part of a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System by the Federal Government in 2010. Mr. Drake then said that there had been discussions about a sanitary sewer being constructed when the Otter exhibit was originally built.

He added that although he was unable to find out why nothing was done at that time, that the City could not issue another permit without a sanitary sewer connection, period. The water needs to be directed to some kind of sanitary sewer.

Mr. Coburn then said that everyone could argue all day about this, but it would not change anything. Mr. Olley maintained that the water issue should be unrelated to the site plan. Ms. Capone then told Mr. Olley that since he still could not get a building permit, that it made sense to table the application until things get cleared up. Ms. Freda then told Mr. Olley that he would need to meet with the City Engineering Department to figure things out.

Mr. Katzman then asked if the zoo could install a septic tank and a leech field to solve this problem. Mr. Olley replied that this could not be done in the City of Watertown. He added that you could put a toilet in for employees and that it was the kind of thing that Mr. Drake could design in his sleep. Ms. Freda then said that a toilet still wouldn't resolve the issue of disposing of water from the otter exhibit.

Mr. Olley then said again that that pool was not a sanitary issue. He said that the City should make all these improvements; and that if that isn't considered, that the zoo will never expand again.

Mr. Coburn then moved to table the request for a waiver of site plan approval submitted by Edward G. Olley Jr. of GYMO, D.P.C., on behalf of the New York State Zoo for the construction of a 579 square-foot building addition to the Otter Exhibit at the New York State Zoo, located at 1 Thompson Park, Parcel Number 12-30-101.000. Ms. Capone seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL 131 WASHINGTON STREET – PARCEL # 11-01-213.000

The Planning Board then considered a request for site plan approval submitted by the Northern New York Community Foundation for the construction of an approximately 4,266 square-foot, three-story addition and a 14-space parking lot located at 131 Washington Street, Parcel Number 11-01-213.000. Andrew F. Jackson, AIA, of Bernier, Carr & Associates, Engineers, Architects and Land Surveyors, P.C. and Rande Richardson, Executive Director of the Northern New York Community Foundation were in attendance to represent the project before the Planning Board.

At this time, Mr. Coburn notified the other Planning Board members that he would abstain from discussing or voting on this project from this due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Jackson began by giving a brief overview of the project. He said that the Northern New York Community Foundation proposed renovating 131 Washington Street, more commonly referred to as the Black River Valley Club, and creating a new home for the Foundation. He said they proposed creating high-quality office space in the existing building and constructing a 25' x 56' addition on the southeast side.

Mr. Jackson then referred to an illustration he had on an easel. He first identified the original three-story building, built in 1906, and then identified the 1923-24 two-story addition in the rear, which he said they planned to demolish, and was also where the proposed addition would be constructed. He said the main purposes of the addition were for the elevator, handicap accessibility, restrooms, new meeting space and reception space. The remainder of the property, he said, would be paved and converted into parking. He added that the retaining wall will be redone and will look much better once it is completed.

Mr. Jackson then discussed the original 1906 section of the building, which he said they plan on restoring to its original 1906 condition. He said that they plan to be very sensitive to the historic aspects of the Washington Street side. He added that the addition would go together with the existing building and be a seamless complement. At this time, Mr. Jackson asked the members of the Planning Board if they had any questions.

Ms. Freda then asked if the proposed fire escape on the YMCA side of the building was required by the Building Code. Mr. Jackson replied that they had proposed that as a means of egress from the existing building, but that as of today, they planned on deleting that from the project. Ms. Freda followed up by asking if the fire escape encroached on the YMCA's property. Mr. Jackson replied that there was an encroachment issue as well as an issue with fire truck access, and that visually, it was not really desirable.

Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Jackson if he had obtained a letter from the owner of 215 Washington Street for work to be performed on the neighboring property. Mr. Jackson replied that as of today, Purcell Construction had been in discussions with Brian Murray of Washington Street Properties, LLC. Mr. Jackson told the Planning Board that they would have an agreement for pedestrian and vehicular access across the property at 215 Washington Street.

Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Jackson if he would like to go through the summary items in Staff's Memorandum with the Planning Board. Mr. Jackson agreed. He first addressed Staff's requirement for a pedestrian and vehicular circulation plan, which Mr. Jackson agreed to add to the site plan materials.

Ms. Freda asked if it was feasible for the applicant to depict fire truck turning radii on this plan. Mr. Drake then said that the issue with the fire truck is that the applicant needed to show that it could make it past the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Drake then pointed out the area of concern on the applicant's site plan. Mr. Drake added that the City's preference was that a fire truck could access the neighboring YMCA lot, which sits several feet lower than the applicant's lot.

Mike Altieri, a Civil Engineer in the applicant's team, asked if the alley from Franklin Street would provide sufficient access for a fire truck. City Fire Chief Dale Herman replied that the alley from Franklin Street was too narrow for a fire truck to pass through. He added that if there were no access from the applicant's lot, that a fire truck would need to access the site via Goodale Street, and he was unsure that that was feasible.

Ms. Freda asked Mr. Herman for some clarification. Mr. Herman replied that a fire truck could not use the alley between the Black River Valley Club and the YMCA as

proposed but that it was crucial that a fire truck be able to use that alley. Mr. Drake said that removing the proposed fire escape should solve that problem.

Mr. Altieri asked if they needed to show a fire truck in the new circulation plan. Mr. Drake replied that the applicant would need to show a fire truck in the YMCA lot. Mr. Alteri noted that the YMCA lot is usually full of cars.

Ms. Freda then asked if the proposed new addition would be sprinklered. Mr. Jackson replied that the entire building would be sprinklered, even the old part.

Mr. Jackson then addressed the item that requested clarification of pedestrian access. He said that pedestrian access would be at the rear of the building and that he would provide the City with details. He added that this would be further addressed with the letter from Brian Murray. Mr. Lumbis then asked for confirmation that primary pedestrian access would be from the rear and Mr. Jackson confirmed that.

Ms. Freda then asked what would happen to the front door on Washington Street. Mr. Jackson replied that the front door would be used primarily as an exit. Ms. Fields then asked if the door was remaining largely for historic preservation reasons. Mr. Jackson replied that it was both to maintain the historic look and to provide an exit from the building.

Mr. Jackson then acknowledged the need to complete a State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) due to the property's presence in a historic district that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. He said that the applicant would submit a Full EAF to the City.

Mr. Urda then said to Mr. Jackson that because County review was required, it would be necessary for him to submit the form to the City by December 15, so that the City could include the completed EAF when it refers the proposal to the Jefferson County Planning Board for that board's December 29 meeting.

Ms. Freda then asked if the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) needed a completed Full EAF to perform their review of the project. Mr. Urda replied that SHPO did not need the completed form. He said that Staff would contact SHPO as an interested agency under SEQR and refer the project details to SHPO. Mr. Urda then said the City Council is still the lead agency under SEQR in this matter, and that the Council would take SHPO's review and comments under advisement when it completes Parts II and III of the EAF.

Mr. Jackson then moved on to other summary items in Staff's Memorandum. He said that the applicant would provide copies all easements as requested. He also said that they would prepare a photometric plan, which Staff also requested. Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Jackson if any light poles were proposed.

Mr. Jackson replied that they were proposing one light pole on the proposed landscaped median adjacent to the parking lot. He added that it would have enough wattage to cover the entire lot. Mr. Drake then said that no more than a 0.5 footcandle spillage was permitted across a property line. Mr. Jackson said that he would have his engineer look at that.

He also said that they planned to have lighting at the entrance to the building, and that some would be ambient and some would be for safety.

Mr. Jackson then moved on to Staff's request for a hydraulic analysis, including an updated hydrant flow. He said that they would work with the City Water Department to cover all requirements. He then addressed Staff's concern about the location of the water connection on the neighbor's private property.

Jeff Walseman of Purcell Construction, another member of the applicant's team, said that he had spoken with Kevin Patchen, Supervisor of Water Distribution, to talk water options. Mr. Walseman said that there were two options. He said that the first option was to stay connected to the existing 4" main and change the 2" access valve to a 4" access valve. He said that this was the applicant's preferred option.

Mr. Walseman said that the second option was connect to the 8" main as originally shown on the site plan, but to do it further out into the right-of-way, and not in the neighbor's property.

Mr. Jackson then spoke about the summary items requiring the applicant to address all concerns listed in the "Site Plan Document Comments" and "Other Engineering Comments" sections of Staff's Memorandum. Mr. Jackson said that he had no issues incorporating any of those comments. He then addressed the requirement to indicate the proposed hours of operation, and said that for the actual business, the hours would be 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Ms. Freda then asked if there had been any consideration or discussion about whether YMCA clients could park in the lot after 6 p.m. Mr. Walseman replied that it would be possible. Mr. Rowell said that the YMCA leases parking spaces behind the old Agricultural Building located at 215 Washington Street. Mr. Jackson then said that his team was trying its best to work with both neighbors.

Mr. Jackson then said that the final summary item was to obtain a series of various permits prior to any construction, which his team also had no problems with.

Ms. Capone left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Lumbis then said to Ms. Freda that there was one additional item of concern that came up late in the review process, and was mentioned in Staff's Memorandum but was not listed as a summary item. Mr. Lumbis drew the Planning Board's attention to the "Parking and Vehicle/Pedestrian Circulation" section of the Memorandum. Mr. Lumbis said that the applicant proposed a parking space that was unsafe. Mr. Drake pointed this space out on the site plan that was on display.

Mr. Lumbis said that Staff was concerned that a car parked in the adjacent space would be unable to maneuver out of that space without backing into a car parked in the space in question. Mr. Lumbis then said that Staff recommended eliminating that space from the site plan and using that area for snow storage instead. The Planning Board expressed some confusion

about the safety concern. Mr. Urda then demonstrated on the site plan how the car movements that Mr. Lumbis had described could lead to a crash.

Ms. Fields then asked about landscaping. She noted that the site plan called for two existing trees to be replaced on the Washington Street side and for some smaller trees and bushes to be installed in the rear. Mr. Jackson replied by identifying all proposed tree species on the landscaping plan.

Ms. Freda then noted in the proposed parking lot that faced the YMCA, there were two proposed bollards in each parking space, and asked what their purpose was. Mr. Jackson replied that they were to prevent people from driving their cars into the retaining wall while trying to park. He said that the idea was that the bollard gives out first and there is no damage to the retaining wall.

Ms. Freda then asked if any members of the Planning Board had any other questions. After hearing no questions, she asked Mr. Jackson if he planned to resubmit the proposal. Mr. Jackson replied in the affirmative. Ms. Freda then discussed the Planning Board's options for acting on the proposal.

Mr. Lumbis noted that the Planning Board could table the request until the plans are modified or, as an alternative, the Planning Board could recommend approval to the City Council with conditions. He said that the application also needed County approval and that the Jefferson County Planning Board did not meet until December 29. Therefore, the City Council would be unable to review the application until January 4. He then added that if the Planning Board tabled the application today and acted on it at its January meeting, the Council would then not be able to consider it until January 18.

Ms. Freda said that she did not see any reason why the applicant would have to resubmit the application. Ms. Fields then made a motion to approve the request for site plan approval submitted by the Northern New York Community Foundation for the construction of an approximately 4,266 square-foot, three-story addition and a 13-space parking lot located at 131 Washington Street, Parcel Number 11-01-213.000 contingent upon the applicant meeting the conditions outlined in the Memorandum.

Mr. Lumbis then said that some of the conditions were already satisfied and could be re-written or removed. Ms. Freda said that there should be a condition requiring removal of the dangerous parking space. Modifications to some of the other conditions were then discussed. Ms. Fields then modified her motion to recommend approval contingent upon the applicant meeting the conditions outlined in the Memorandum, as revised. Mr. Katzman then seconded the motion to approve.

Prior to the vote on the motion, Mr. Urda said to Mr. Jackson that because County review was required, that the Full EAF and other modified materials should be submitted to City Staff by December 15. Mr. Lumbis then said that the most critical thing to have by the 15th was the Full EAF, and that the plans could be sent to the County as they were.

Ms. Freda then asked Mr. Jackson if he was confident that his team could complete a Full EAF within a few days. Mr. Jackson replied that they could.

Following the discussion on the motion, the Planning Board voted 5-0, with Mr. Coburn abstaining and Ms. Capone absent, to approve the request for site plan approval submitted by the Northern New York Community Foundation for the construction of an approximately 4,266 square-foot, three-story addition and a 13-space parking lot located at 131 Washington Street, Parcel Number 11-01-213.000, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide a pedestrian and vehicular circulation plan that shows the movements of a delivery or refuse vehicle as well as City fire truck.
2. The applicant shall remove the easternmost parking space from the site plan to allow the neighboring parked car adequate room to maneuver when leaving the parking space.
3. The applicant shall submit a signed SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form prior to the City Council considering the site plan for approval.
4. The applicant shall obtain a letter from the neighboring property owner at 215 Washington Street that authorizes the applicant to apply for site plan approval for all work to be performed on the neighbor's property. This letter must indicate that the neighboring property owner acknowledges all impacts of the underground utility work that the applicant proposes.
5. The applicant must provide copies of all required easements for underground utilities on adjacent properties, as well as copies of all required easements for all pedestrian and vehicular access across adjacent properties.
6. The applicant shall remove the proposed fire escape on the north side of the building from the site plan.
7. The applicant shall provide a photometric plan that provides light pole and fixture details and depicts lighting levels on the site.
8. The applicant shall include a hydraulic analysis in the Engineering Report and perform an updated hydrant flow test to verify adequate hydraulic capacity exists to serve the renovated building.
9. The proposed water connection shall be located at a location to be determined that is acceptable to the City of Watertown Water Department.
10. The applicant must address all concerns listed in the "Site Plan Document Comments" section to the satisfaction of the City of Watertown Engineering Department.
11. The applicant must address all of the design details noted above in the "Other Engineering Comments" section and submit them to the Engineering Department prior to the issuance of any City permits.

12. The applicant must obtain, minimally, the following permits prior to construction: Building Permit, Storm Sewer Connection Permit, Sidewalk Permit, General City Permit and a Sign Permit.

Ms. Freda then asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Fields then moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katzman and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 PM.